

From: [Thomas Haug](#)
To: Connell, Michael@Wildlife
Cc: [Ryan P Andersen](#)
Subject: RE: Phase 3 Monitoring and Maintenance and Overview Oiling Survey Assessment
Date: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 11:45:15 AM

Mike, below in red are my suggestions as PSC for the UC to consider with regards to LOSC comments.

Thanks, Tom

From: Connell, Michael@Wildlife [mailto:Michael.CConnell@wildlife.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 11:02 AM
To: Thomas Haug
Subject: FW: Phase 3 Monitoring and Maintenance and Overview Oiling Survey Assessment

From: Troy, Robert [mailto:rtroy@sbcoem.org]
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 10:26 AM
To: Connell, Michael@Wildlife
Cc: Rockabrand, Ryan
Subject: FW: Phase 3 Monitoring and Maintenance and Overview Oiling Survey Assessment

FYI, see below...

From: Troy, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2015 9:33 AM
To: 'Gold, Jennifer@Wildlife'
Cc: Rockabrand, Ryan
Subject: RE: Phase 3 Monitoring and Maintenance and Overview Oiling Survey Assessment

Hi Jennifer,

Below is a list of informal comments and questions regarding both documents. We would still like the opportunity to review the revised documents when they are available, based off of all UC feedback.

Thanks,
Bob

Overview Oiling Survey Assessment

- Overall, this is a helpful step in addressing our concerns regarding inspections of beaches that have already been “signed off”. - agreed

- If sampling is to begin on 7/8, this Wednesday, presumably the shoreline divisions to be inspected have already been chosen. However, the text states that this selection process will incorporate local knowledge. How and when is selection and incorporation of local knowledge proposed to occur? The areas selected for survey are important and need to be well reasoned. Can we have an opportunity to have local stakeholder input into site inspection locations? - The team lead (OSPR) will take the comments/suggestions of the other team members into consideration and decide where oil sample will be taken for each Division.
- The text states that a second reconnaissance-level oiling assessment survey ***may*** be conducted after winter storms around March 2016. This should be a ***shall***. Also, possibly include a mid-winter assessment as well. It seems that the document mixes both the immediate survey and the Phase III proposal. Should this document should only address the immediate survey and not include elements of Phase III? - This comment should not be included in the Sampling 'blitz' plan. This effort is intended to a one-time event. Any reference to additional sampling efforts will be something which will be considered by the UC at a later time.
-
- How many tarballs would be collected per division? It is conceivable that tarballs on a beach may be present from multiple sources. If only one tarball is collected, the analytical results might falsely lead to a conclusion that there is no Line 901 oil on the beach. The *"Fingerprinting Sampling and Analysis Plan"* does not provide direction on the number of samples to be collected either. - One tar ball will taken from each Division. The only exception will be SB division N due to the high number of Oil Spill Reports which have been received by the CG National Response Center.
- Results to be shared with stakeholders, which is a positive step. We would request that UC be first presented with results and given sufficient notice prior to press or public release. - agreed.
- Document changed between 7/5 and 7/6 versions to require photographic documentation, which is positive, but some text may have been omitted? - The text which was omitted was determined to be unrelated to this specific effort.
- Text states that if samples come back positive, the beach will be cleaned per Phase II endpoints "where the samples were collected". This statement leaves quite a bit up for interpretation. Would the whole division be cleaned? Or only a certain distance from the location of the sample? - The text of this Plan should indicate that 'if samples come back positive, the division will be revisited by SCAT to determine the appropriate STR for the oil found in the division.'
- Under survey actions, should anything related to Phase III should be excluded? - No. The team lead will determine if areas are unsafe to access. But, this effort is intended to sample fresh oil (tar balls).

Phase III Document

- This now includes signed-off segments from Arroyo Hondo to Goleta Beach – very positive. If other areas are found to have positive 901 results during the OOSA, will they be included as well? We concur that these segments should be monitored monthly “throughout the 2015-2016 winter storm season”. The text and the first flowchart should be revised to reflect this.
- On page 2, paragraph 3, the final sentence indicates that “the maintenance and monitoring phase should not focus on newly fresh oil coming ashore.” If there is Refugio 901 oil coming onshore, it should be a focus of cleanup. Testing should occur to verify the source.
- On page 2, paragraph 6, we suggest “significant storm events” be defined as at least a half inch of rain in a 72 hour period. Monitoring of any subsequently signed off segments should still occur during the winter storm season.
- The County of Santa Barbara requests to be a formal member of SCAT, to the degree that training and certification will allow.
- In the partial paragraph on the top of page 3, different forms are proposed depending on whether Phase II signoff has occurred. If Phase II areas require additional cleanup based on the survey, shouldn't the more detailed process/forms be used?
- In the first full paragraph on page 3, please clarify that any segments under Phase III which are signed off as meeting Phase II endpoints are still subject to further observation/survey after storm events.
- In the second full paragraph, why are segments which meet Phase II endpoints only to be sampled once? This seems to contradict other sections of the document.
- In the last paragraph on page 4, it is not clear why “or in the event that additional Refugio incident contamination is discovered” is included in the list of items agencies can pursue separate from the UC cleanup oversight.

From: Gold, Jennifer@Wildlife [<mailto:Jennifer.Gold@wildlife.ca.gov>]

Sent: Monday, July 6, 2015 11:18 AM

To: jennifer.f.williams@uscg.mil; Crossland, Mark@Wildlife; PDHodgins@paalp.com; Troy, Robert; waldon.margaret@epa.gov; 'paul.l.jones@uscg.mil' (paul.l.jones@uscg.mil); Eric Hjelstrom; charlene.l.downey@uscg.mil; Rockabrand, Ryan

Cc: thaug@wittobriens.com; RefugioSITL@gmail.com; Connell, Michael@Wildlife

Subject: Phase 3 Monitoring and Maintenance and Overview Oiling Survey Assessment

Hello Everyone-

Please review Phase 3 and the Overview Oiling Survey Assessment and provide comments by tomorrow at 10 am.

Thanks

Jennifer

Jennifer Gold

California Department of Fish and Wildlife,
Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR)
Scientific, Field Response Team
Cell Phone- (805) 450-8695
1933 Cliff Dr. Suite 9, Santa Barbara, Ca 93109
Jennifer.Gold@wildlife.ca.gov